REMARKS

I. Introduction

In response to the Office Action dated June 7, 2006, claims 11 and 21 have been amended, and claim 24 has been canceled. Claims 1-23 and 25-30 remain in the application. Re-examination and re-consideration of the application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

II. Claim Amendments

Applicant's attorney has made amendments to the claims as indicated above. These amendments were made solely for the purpose of clarifying the language of the claims, and were not required for patentability or to distinguish the claims over the prior art.

III. Prior Art Rejections

In paragraph (1) of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 7-15, 19, 20, 29 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Dye et al., U.S Publication 2002/0145611 (Dye). In paragraph (2) of the Office Action, claims 4-6 and 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dye. In paragraph (3) of the Office Action, claims 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Voois et al., U.S. Patent 6,215,515 (Voois). In paragraph 4, claims 24-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Voois.

A. The Dye Reference

Dye describes a graphics controller which performs display list-based video refresh operations that enable objects with independent frame rates to be efficiently assembled. The graphics controller maintains a virtual display refresh list (VDRL) comprising a plurality of pointers to scan line segments in memory. The graphics controller also creates, maintains, and deletes draw display lists (DDLs) that comprise pointers to object display list subroutines (ODLs) that independently draw objects in memory. The ODLs may allocate one or more buffers in memory into which different frames of the objects are drawn. When an ODL has completed executing, the corresponding pointer in the DDL may be updated to point to the buffer location in memory that stores the newly completed object frame. The VDRL is maintained independently (and may be doubled-buffered) and is updated using the DDLs. Motion estimation may be performed by the

graphics controller using the different frames of objects that are drawn into memory by the ODLs. The different object frames may also be animated by the graphics controller once they are drawn into memory. The object frames stored in memory may be compressed to conserve memory.

Dye also discusses motion estimation (see Paragraphs [0455] through [0463]). Synchronization and blending of multiple data types that are animated is discussed to change the frame rate of the signals involved (see paragraph [0461]).

B. The Voois Reference

Voois merely describes a videophone apparatus with an on-screen telephone keypad user-interface. The videophone communicates video and audio data over a plain old telephone service (POTS) line and includes a video source and a communication channel interface circuit coupled to a programmable processor. The programmable processor is configured and arranged to execute a user interface program for user controlled operation of the videophone apparatus, display a first menu on the display, the first menu referencing a first plurality of options for operating the videophone apparatus and having associated therewith respective indicators of telephone keypad buttons, receive from the telephone keypad a first selection signal indicative of a pressed button, and initiate an operation to control the videophone apparatus in response to the first selection signal.

C. The Claims are Patentable over the Cited References

Independent claims 1, 11, 14, 21 and 29 are generally directed to personal multimedia devices and video conferencing systems. A personal multimedia device in accordance with the present invention comprises a media processing component configured to detect a frame rate of a received video signal, compare the frame rate to a frame rate native to the personal multimedia device, increase a frame rate of the received video signal when the frame rate of the received video signal is less than the frame rate native to the personal multimedia device by adding frames to the received video signal where the added frames are based on at least one of the received frames, and decrease the frame rate of the received video signal when the frame rate of the received video signal is greater than the frame rate native to the personal multimedia device by removing frames from the received video signal.

The cited references do not teach nor suggest these various elements of Applicant's independent claims. Specifically, the cited references do not teach nor suggest at least the limitation

of removing frames from the received video signal when the frame rate of the received video signal is greater than the frame rate native to the personal multimedia device as recited in the claims of the present invention.

The Office Action states that increasing or decreasing the frame rate inherently requires by (1) adding some form of interpolation to generate interposing frames to increase the frame count/unit time, and (2) by dropping frames to remove video information in a lessening of frames per unit time. See Office Action Page 2, last paragraph. Applicants respectfully disagree with this characterization of the reference. Dye specifically states that a blending of the frame rates occurs, in paragraphs [[0455] through [0463], where the "up-convert and down-convert" of frame rates is discussed. Rather than drop a frame, Dye specifically teaches that two frames are interpolated to become a single frame in the "new" frame rate, whether that frame is an up-converted frame or a down-converted frame. Nowhere does Dye state that frames are removed from the received video signal.

Dye changes the frame rate by adding intermediate frames when the frame rate needs to be increased, and, in essence, by compressing the existing frames when the frame rate needs to be reduced. This addition and compression shown in Dye does not teach nor suggest removing frames from the received video signal when the frame rate of the received video signal is greater than the frame rate native to the personal multimedia device, as recited in the claims of the present invention.

The ancillary Voois reference does not remedy the deficiencies of the Dye reference. Specifically, Voois does not teach nor suggest removing frames from the received video signal when the frame rate of the received video signal is greater than the frame rate native to the personal multimedia device as recited in the claims of the present invention.

Moreover, the various elements of Applicant's claimed invention together provide operational advantages over Dye and Voois. In addition, Applicant's invention solves problems not recognized by Dye and Voois.

Thus, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 11, 14, 21 and 29 are allowable over Dye and Voois. Further, dependent claims 2-10, 12, 13, 15-20, 22-23, 25-28 and 30 are submitted to be allowable over Dye and Voois in the same manner, because they are dependent on independent claims 1, 11, 14, 21 and 29, respectively, and thus contain all the limitations of the independent claims. In addition, dependent claims 2-10, 12, 13, 15-20, 22-23, 25-28, and 30 recite additional novel elements not shown by Dye and Voois.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is now in good order for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner believe minor matters still remain that can be resolved in a telephone interview, the Examinet is urged to call Applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Georgann S. Grunebach, Registration No.: 33,179
Attorney for Applicants

Date: July 19, 2006

The DIRECTV Group, Inc.
RE / R08 / A109
P.O. Box 956
2230 E. Imperial Highway
El Segundo, CA 90245-0946

Phone: (310) 964-4615